

REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel adhesive for single- or double-sided adhesive film strips that are redetachable without residue or destruction by extensive stretching.

Claims 1-11 are pending; claim 11 being added by this amendment. Claim 11 is being added to limit the metal chelates to aluminum or titanium acetylacetonate. Support can be found at page 8, line 18 of the specification.

Claim 1 is being amended to more specifically recite that the adhesive are chelate-crosslinked, and not just mixtures. Support can be found at page 10, line 11.

The disclosure has been objected to because of the word "inertizing" on page 9, line 14. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's suggestion that this word be changed to 'inertization' or 'inerting', and have now amended the specification to substitute --inerting-- for "inertizing". It is believed that the objection has been overcome by this amendment, and the objection should accordingly now be withdrawn.

Regarding the information disclosure statement(s) filed 06/02/2006 and 08/21/2006, the Examiner has indicated said statements fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires that copies of certain types of references be submitted, and that said information disclosure statements have been placed in the file but not considered. There were only a few of the references cited in the indicated information

disclosure statements that did not comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), and many that were in compliance. The Examiner did, in fact, initial most of the references cited in the 1449 forms submitted (indicating that they were considered) and drew a line through only those that failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) (indicating that they were not considered).

The statement made by the Examiner in the office action is confusing, however, because the Examiner states that the information disclosure statements were placed in the file and that the information referred to therein has not been considered when, in fact, it was only certain references that did not comply and were not considered, whereas most of the references did comply and apparently were considered.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify the status of the IDSs by indicating on the record that a line was drawn through the references cited on the 1449 forms that were not considered, but that those references that were initialed and not lined out were considered.

Turning now to the substance of the office action, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Groves US 5,623,010.

The Examiner contends that Groves discloses an adhesive film strip, and refers to column 5, lines 34-37 and examples 1-7 at column 10, lines 56-66. Column 10, lines 56-66 of the Groves reference concerns a PRIMER for an adhesive, and not an

adhesive film strip which is detachable by extensive stretching in the direction of the bondline.

The Examiner further contends that Groves, at column 2, lines 40-60, discloses a mixture of an acid-modified or acid anhydride-modified vinylaromatic block copolymer, a metal chelate of Applicants' formula (referring to Tyzor DC® as containing titanium (col. 10, lines 1-5)). Tyzor DC® is described as an ethylaceto-acetate chelate of titanilic acid, and the Examiner has not shown that such a chelate falls within the definition of Applicants' formula.

In order to more clearly distinguish over the chelates disclosed in the Groves reference, Applicants have now added new claim 11, to specifically recite aluminum or titanium acetylacetonate. There is absolutely nothing to be found in the Groves reference that would even remotely suggest a chelate-crosslinked adhesive wherein the chelate used for the crosslinking is aluminum or titanium acetylacetonate.

As a further distinction, it should be noted that the Groves reference is concerned with **polymer blends**, and not with chelate-crosslinked adhesives. Nowhere in the Groves reference can there be found any teaching or suggestion of chelate-crosslinked adhesives.

Still further, it should be noted that Groves concerns a mixture of styrenic block copolymers with a functionalization and an acrylic polymer. It is very common using acrylates to add metal chelates especially with titanium for crosslinking.

To crosslink styrenic block copolymers with metal chelates is quite new, however. In the Groves reference there is only one example given for a pressure sensitive adhesive, Example 19. In this example a mixture of blockcopolymers and resins is used and combined with an acrylic adhesive. **It is explicitly mentioned that no metal chelate is used in this example.** So by reading this reference, one could not know that the addition of the chelates to styrenic blockcopolymers would be of any advantage.

A particularly novel and advantageous aspect of Applicants' invention is that Applicants' novel crosslinked adhesive is still elastic enough that it can be stretched very far so as to be redetachable by stretching in the bond plain.

Accordingly, the Groves reference cannot fairly be seen as teaching or suggesting Applicants' novel chelate-crosslinked adhesive film strip, and the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Groves US 5,623,010 should now be withdrawn.

In view of the present remarks it is believed that claims 1 -11 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By /William C. Gerstenzang/
William C. Gerstenzang
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmh

875 Third Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Tel.: (212) 808-0700
Fax: (212) 808-0844